UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,690	06/27/2003	Ram Gopal Lakshmi Narayanan	042933/263792	9684

826   7590   10/02/2006

ALSTON & BIRD LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER
WILLIAMS, JEFFERY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 July 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _06 November 2002_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

1   **DETAILED ACTION**

2

3   This action is in response to the communication filed on 7/18/2006.

4   All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

5   Claims 1 – 20 are pending.

6

7   ***Drawings***

8

9   Figures 1, 2, 3, 5A, and 5B should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-

10   - because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected

11   drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action

12   to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled

13   "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct

14   any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

15   applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office

16   action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

17

18   ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

19

20   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

21   form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

22   A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

6   Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boden

7   et al. (Boden), "System and Method for Managing Security Objects", U.S. Patent 6,330,

8   562.

9

10   Regarding claim 1, Boden discloses:

11   *providing a plurality of security policies (7:51-58), wherein each security policy*

12 *includes an application instance identifier associated with a security service, at least two*

13 *application instance identifiers being associated with different security services (3:61-*

14 64; 7:29-29; 12:60-13:5).* Boden discloses that each application (i.e. an IKE application

15 and an VPN manager application) may identify, within a policy, to the system to employ

16 IPSec as a way of providing security services. Each of the plurality of established

17 policies may have associated with them differing security services (6:52-67).

18   *and creating at least one security association, wherein the at least one security*

19 *association is created based upon the at least one security service (2:3-8) associated*

20 *with at least one application instance identifier to thereby create a centralized key store*

21 *including the plurality of security policies and the at least one security association (figs.*

22 *3-3d; 3:23-36).*

23

24   Regarding claims 6 and 11 they are rejected, at least, for the same reasons as

25 claim 1, and because Boden further discloses:

1   *a first security gateway configured for providing a plurality of security policies* (fig.

2   1:18, 19) ... wherein the first security gateway is configured for *applying a security*

3   *service associated with an identified* (7:29-29; 12:60-13:5) *application instance identifier*

4   *to at least one packet of data to thereby transform the at least one packet of data,*

5   *wherein the first security gateway is configured for applying the security service to the at*

6   *least one packet based upon at least one security policy and at least one security*

7   *association* (fig. 1; 3:60-4:4; 6:13-31; 11:table 1); *and a second security gateway*

8   *configured for applying the security service associated with the identified application*

9   *instance identifier to the at least one transformed packet of data to thereby generate a*

10   *representation of the at least one packet of data* (fig. 1; 3:60-4:4; 6:13-31; 11:table 1);

11

12

13   Regarding claims 2, 3, 9, 12, and 14, Boden further discloses a system

14   comprising sending and receiving gateways. Each gateway further comprises a

15   VPN/user application capable of creating and accessing policies within a policy

16   definition database (3:60-4:16). Both the sending and receiving gateways receive and

17   transmit packets of which are transformed upon transmission or reception according to

18   (application identified) security services between nodes (3:1-20; 3:60-4:16; fig. 1).

19

20   Regarding claims 4, 8, and 13, Boden further discloses:

21   *at least one security policy further including at least one selector field having at*

22   *least one selector value in a format common to a plurality of security service protocols,*

1 *and wherein applying the security service comprises applying the security service*

2 *further based upon the at least one security policy including the at least one selector*

3 *value* (11:table 1; figs. 3-3d; 13:13-50; 13:62-14:25). Boden discloses a security policy

4 having common selector fields in addition to the application defined identifiers, wherein

5 security services are based upon the selector fields.

6

7 Regarding claims 7, it is rejected, at least, for the same reasons as claims 1 and

8 6.

9

10 Regarding claims 5, 10, and 15, Boden further discloses *creating at least one*

11 *security association according to an Internet Key Exchange (IKE) technique* (3:60-4:16).

12 Regarding claims 16 – 20, they are the features and limitations of the above

13 rejected claims embodies as computer instructions upon a medium. Thus, they are

14 rejected, at least, for the same reasons as the above rejected claims, and further

15 because Boden discloses *a computer program product for creating and maintaining a*

16 *centralized key store* (15:62-16:6).

17

18 **Response to Arguments**

19

20 Applicant's arguments filed 7/18/2006 have been fully considered but they are

21 not persuasive.

22

1   .   Applicant argues primarily that:

2

3   (i)   *As to the objection to FIGS. 1-3, 5A and 5B as failing to include the legend*

4   *identifying those figures as illustrating prior art, Applicant respectfully submits that those*

5   *figures do not in fact illustrate prior art. Rather, FIGS. 1-3, 5A and 5B illustrate systems,*

6   *apparatuses and methods in accordance with exemplary embodiments of the present*

7   *invention. See Pat. Appl., page 6, line 26 - page 7, line 6.* (Remarks, pg. 9)

8

9   In response, the examiner respectfully reasserts that the above mentioned

10   drawings do not show the applicant's invention and illustrate what was already known to

11   those of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, the designation of "Prior Art" should be applied.

12   For example, the applicant's figure '1' illustrates the general system of a host/security

13   gateway found within prior art RFC 2401 [see pg. 11], as is even referenced by the

14   applicant. For example, figure '2' illustrates a block diagram of a computer, including an

15   interface, memory, and processor. Figure 2 further illustrates the storage of SAD and

16   SPD databases. Such is not the invention of the applicant and was well known to those

17   of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, the other drawings (figure 3 [mobile telephone]

18   and figures 5A, 5B [conventional IPSec processing of packets]) also illustrate only what

19   is old.

20

21   (ii)   *In contrast to amended independent Claim 1, Boden does not teach or suggest a*

22   *centralized key store with security policies, each of which includes an application*

1   *instance identifier associated with a security service, or one or more security*

2   *associations created based upon security service(s) associated with the application*

3   *instance identifier(s).   In this regard, ... In no event, however, does Boden disclose*

4   *applying a security service other than IPSec such that the security policies include*

5   *application instance identifiers associated with security services.* (Remarks, pg. 10)

6

7   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

8   features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

9   (i.e., *applying a security service other than IPSec such that the security policies include*

10   *application instance identifiers associated with security services*) are not recited in the

11   rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

12   limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

13   F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

14

15   (iii)   *The claimed invention, on the other hand, recites a centralized key store*

16   *including a plurality of security policies each of which includes an application instance*

17   *identifier associated with a respective security service, at least two of the application*

18   *instance identifiers being associated with different security services.* (Remarks, pg.

19   10,11)

20

21   In response, the examiner asserts [as also shown in the above rejections] that

22   prior art shows a "centralized key store", a collection of security policies employed by a

1 plurality of applications (i.e. IKE, a VPN manager), each application utilizing one or

2 more policies identified as being an application of IPSec for providing different security

3 services.

4

5   *Conclusion*

6

7   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

8 applicant's disclosure:

9   *see Notice of References Cited*

10

11   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

12 policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

13   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

14 MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

15 TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

16 mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

17 shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

18 extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

19 the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

20 than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

21

1   A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire **3** months (not less than 90

2   days) from the mailing date of this communication.

3   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

4   examiner should be directed to Jeffery Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-

5   7965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

6   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

7   supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone

8   number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)

9   872-9306.

10   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

11   Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

12   published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

13   Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

14   For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

15   you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

16   Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

17

18
19   J. Williams
20   AU 2137
21   JW

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER